

General Plan Program Citizens' Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting #6 – September 29, 2003

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the General Plan program held its sixth meeting on Monday, September 29, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. in the Mayor's Ceremonial Room, 7th floor, City Hall. Attendees were as follows:

CAC Members

Chair Dave Leonard
Mike Fine
Sally Silva
Tom Pevehouse
Manuel Carrasco
Matt Webb
Barry Johnson
George Flower
Dave McNiel
Maynard Lowry
Morgan Keith
Bill Warkentin
Finn Comer

Interested Party

John Collins

City Staff

Ken Gutierrez, Planning Director
Craig Aaron, Principal Planner
Diane Jenkins, AICP, Senior Planner
Patricia Brenes, Associate Planner
Robert Laag, Planning Intern

Consultant Team

Laura Stetson, Cotton/Bridges/Associates
Brian Boecking, Cotton/Bridges/Associates
John Cook, Cotton/Bridges/Associates
Jean D'Agostino, The Arroyo Group

Chair Leonard called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

CAC Policy Regarding Individual Redesignation Requests

Chair Leonard introduced a proposed policy statement regarding individual requests for General Plan land use re-designations. He stated that staff recommends that the CAC focus on land use changes that have broad policy implications rather than individual, parcel-level requests. After some discussion, Dave McNiel moved approval; Sally Silva seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion carried and the policy was adopted.

Public Participation

Chair Leonard asked that members of public in attendance reserve their comments. Per the agenda, time would be left at the end of the meeting to address these.

Minutes, September 8, 2003 CAC Meeting

Chair Leonard noted the following change to these minutes:

Page 3, 3rd paragraph: change “well-planned growth” to “concentrated well-planned growth”

No other changes were requested. Tom Pevehouse moved approval as amended; Finn Comer seconded. All were in favor, the motion carried and the amended minutes were accepted.

Land Use Considerations

Laura Stetson stated the key objectives for the meeting:

Get land use recommendations for each of the identified sites
Get feedback on what is meant by “mixed use”

SITE 1: LA SIERRA METROLINK AREA

Current General Plan: Low Density Residential

Current Land Use: Mobile home park with 200-300 units

Recommendation: Over 20 years, transition to industrial business use consistent with other properties in the vicinity. Intent is to expand business opportunities in this area.

Discussion

Director Gutierrez stated that adopting this recommendation would only change the General Plan. The mobile home park would continue to exist. Zoning would not change.

Dave McNiel stated that this change could cause concern among people who don't understand the distinction between the General Plan and zoning. He stated that there is a residential area nearby. How would the proposed change to industrial use affect the character of that area? He also expressed concern about scarcity of availability of housing for seniors. Tom Pevehouse stated that there is a need to make decisions that will be useful over the long term.

After further discussion, Chair Leonard called for a vote on adopting the recommended change. A voice vote indicated approval of adopting the recommended change. Chair Leonard added that there was a need to correct the map, as the corner parcel was shown

incorrectly and should be Commercial. He also stated that the adjacent mini-warehouse site should be reclassified to Industrial/business.

SITE 2: MAGNOLIA/PIERCE SOUTH OF FREEWAY

Current General Plan: Commercial

Current Land Use: Shopping center on north side; southwest corner vacant, southeast corner is primarily retail, but part of surrounding industrial center (gas station, restaurant)

Recommendation: Make the Commercial pieces Industrial

Discussion

Stetson stated that this recommendation was consistent with the Husing study's recommendation to increase the supply of land designated for industrial use.

Comer stated that the Husing study also says to improve the retail sales tax base. He stated that it might be better to put a Costco store here than a distribution center. He recommended against changing the General Plan designation. McNiel agreed.

Director Gutierrez stated that the current General Plan vision for this area is small machine shops and limited retail. He added that studies show that Riverside is overbuilt with commercial space and that such space would be better concentrated in other areas. He said he liked the suggestion of mixing industrial and retail uses on a small scale.

After further discussion, Chair Leonard stated that the consensus of the group appeared to be to redesignate the area to a Commercial-Industrial Mixed Use designation.

SITE 3: MAGNOLIA & FILLMORE, NORTH of 91

Current General Plan: Commercial

Current Land Use: Vacant; surrounded by high density residential

Recommendation: Industrial

Discussion

Chair Leonard stated that this site is very visible but has access problems, so something other than commercial might be appropriate.

Morgan Keith stated that the site might be good for residential uses. Tom Pevehouse stated that the site's freeway visibility seemed to beg for some form of commercial use. After further discussion, Chair Leonard stated that the group's consensus for the site was mixed use, with a focus on higher-density residential and supportive commercial uses.

SITE 4: CORNER OF GOLDEN AND RIVERWALK

Current General Plan: Commercial Business

Current Land Use: Light industrial; owned by La Sierra University

Recommendation: Mixed uses that would relate to what is across from Riverwalk

Discussion

After a short discussion, the consensus of the group appeared to be for Commercial/Residential Mixed Use, at a medium/high density.

Site 5: FIVE POINTS

Current General Plan: Commercial Business

Current LAND USE: Various

Recommendation: Mixed-use neighborhood

Discussion

Chair Leonard stated the need to have a boundary change because more area would be needed to make any meaningful change. His proposal expanded the area to include partial-block areas that had not been selected on the working map. Bill Warkentin suggested that General Plan boundaries extend for full blocks so that uses not be changed mid block.

Following a short discussion, the consensus recommendation was for Commercial Focused Mixed Use (entertainment uses in particular); moderate intensity residential uses would be secondary.

SITE 6: KAISER PROPERTY/SURROUNDING USES

Current General Plan: Commercial Business, Public Facilities, High-density Residential

Current Land Use: Various – Kaiser facility, residential

Recommendation: Redesignate entire area as mixed use – residential, office oriented uses that would complement the Kaiser facility

Discussion

Director Gutierrez stated that a redevelopment plan is proposed for this area.

Manuel Carrasco suggested extending the northern boundary of the mixed use zone because the proposal showed the area to be just one lot deep, but he added that existing single-family neighborhoods in the area should be preserved as single-family neighborhoods.

After discussion, the consensus of the group appeared to be favoring higher intensity Mixed Uses on the south side of Magnolia, but of a more moderate intensity on the north side, based on infrastructure availability. Following this, the group discussed how density does and does not impact area traffic, crime rates, and other quality of life issues.

SITE 7: LA SIERRA METROLINK STATION (southern portion)

Current General Plan: La Sierra Specific Plan; commercial/business, office – low rise, general industrial

Current Land Use: Various, including vacant sites

Recommendation: North of Indiana: Mixed Use neighborhood

South of Indiana: Variable Residential Density

Discussion

Director Gutierrez stated that a developer is interested in doing a variable density residential project on the south side of Indiana, with 3 or 4 levels of homeownership, with a low of 4 units per acre and a high up to 6-8 units per acre. He stated that this neighborhood is adverse to any apartments.

After further discussion, the consensus appeared to be recommending Very High Density Residential for the portion north of Indiana and a maximum average density of 14 units/acre for the portion south of Indiana, with an underlying Variable Residential Density designation.

Site 8: ROHR PROPERTY

Current General Plan: Industrial

Current Land Use: Industrial; some residential

Recommendation: Reduce industrial area; add Mixed Use along Cypress

Discussion

Bill Warkentin stated that the site was in a terrible area for industrial use; it would be a good idea for a master-planned mixed-use community. He stated that the group had two choices: leave the site as it is, or make a statement about what the site could be many years in the future. Tom Pevehouse and Director Gutierrez noted the site's environmental problems; it would be a potential candidate for Superfund designation.

After discussion, the group's recommendation was for Mixed Use (office, light industrial) on the entire site, including current residential properties. The area west of Rutland would be Light Industrial (M-1).

SITE 9: VAN BUREN & ARLINGTON

Current General Plan: Commercial business

Current Land Use: Retail

Recommendation: Mixed-use neighborhood

Discussion

The group accepted the recommendation to change the site to residentially focused Mixed Use at a moderate intensity.

SITE 10: VAN BUREN/CHALLENGER

Current General Plan: Commercial-Business

Current Land Use: Commercial retail

Recommendation: Mixed Use neighborhood

Discussion

After a short discussion, the group accepted the recommendation that the site be redesignated for Mixed Use with a residential focus at a higher density (2-3 stories). The boundary of this area was extended south along Van Buren to include the property at the corner.

SITE 11: DAWES STREET

Current General Plan: Residential high density

Current Land Use: Residential, 2 story, 20 units/acre

Recommendation: Commercial business

Discussion

Laura Stetson stated that the recommendation for change stems from the fact that the site is an isolated residential pocket that would perhaps make more sense being used to expand adjacent commercial areas. The group accepted the recommendation.

SITE 12: MAGNOLIA & VAN BUREN

Current General Plan: Commercial/business; low-rise office, medium intensity residential

Current Land Use: Various

Recommendation: Medium intensity Mixed Use at "village scale" in tune with Arlington Community Plan; lower-intensity service commercial

Discussion

Tom Pevehouse stated that he hasn't heard an outcry for change in this area; Manuel Carrasco stated that the Arlington Community Plan was only recently adopted. The group consensus was to make no change in this area and recommend mixed use vertical with commercial on the first floor and residential on floors above.

SITE 13: CALIFORNIA AVENUE AT MONROE

Current General Plan: Commercial shopping center

Current Land Use: Underutilized (old Alpha-Beta site)

Recommendation: Mixed use; neighborhood-oriented commercial

Discussion

The group accepted the recommendation of neighborhood-oriented Commercial uses with residential uses at medium-high intensity.

SITE 14: MAGNOLIA/MONROE

Current General Plan: Residential; mostly high density; some medium density

Current Land Use: Residential, various densities

Recommendation: Higher density residential than current designation permits

Discussion

Laura Stetson and Jean D'Agostino stated that this proposal stemmed from a Magnolia/Market Subcommittee recommendation to increase the intensity of residential use in this area. The group was asked to consider densities of up to 40 units/acre for this area, given its proximity to transit and available services. Robert Laag stated that the area included an MWD right-of-way area on which no building is permitted.

The group opted not to redesignate to higher density the strip of single family residences on the north side of Magnolia between Monroe Street and Melody Lane. The group did not achieve consensus on an appropriate level of density for this area. Laura Stetson offered to bring to the next meeting photos of higher density projects (over 20 units/acre) to help the group in its decision making.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.